

Ser. No. 10/002,684

Remarks

Claims 1-9 were pending in the application. Claims 1-9 were rejected. By the foregoing amendment, claims 10-20 are canceled, claim 6 is amended and claims 21-25 are added. No new matter is presented.

Election/Restriction

The restriction requirement was made final. By the foregoing amendment, claims 10-20 have been canceled merely to permit the addition of further claims without fee. The cancellation is without prejudice to pursuit of such canceled claims in any continuing application.

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). The Examiner asserted that "the radial section must be shown ...". The objection is traversed.

The term "section" is used as in "cross-section" rather than "portion". By the foregoing amendment, claim 6 has been amended to clarify this. The drawings are longitudinal radial sectional views.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,227,546 of Halling. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In the discussion of Halling at page 3 of the Office action, it appears the Examiner has reversed the identified interior and exterior volumes. However, this does not appear relevant to the broadest claims. The Examiner has, however, ignored the claim 1 (see also new claim 22)

Ser. No. 10/002,684

element that the second layer is "integrated with the first layer". Halling '546 identifies "nested plies[that] are free to act as independent entities when contact is established with the co-operating surfaces." Col. 1, lines 51-56. This is not the "integrated" structure of claim 1 for which support is found at page 4, lines 9-12 of the present specification. Furthermore, Halling does not appear to identify the compressive strength properties of claim 6. Nevertheless, in view of the overcoming of the underlying rejection of claim 1, all the dependent claims are patentable.

Claims Rejections- 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 8 & 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Halling '546 in view of U.S. patent no. 6,302,402 of Rynders et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As to claim 8, the Examiner merely cited a portion of Rynders et al. which identifies an overlapping target temperature range. Rynders et al. does not necessarily teach the particular relative stress relaxation resistance. Regarding claim 9, the Examiner asserted that Rynders et al. teaches that the second layer is "cast-hardened nickel". However, the identified portion of Rynders et al. merely lists nickel amongst coating alloys. The use of elemental nickel as a coating alloy is distinguished from the present cast γ hardened nickel-based superalloy. Furthermore, no source has been cited for the motivation to combine the two references. Furthermore, there is no demonstration that the Rynders et al. coating has a higher resistance to stress relaxation than the Rynders et al. base layer.

Support for added claim 21 is seen in claim 19. There is no suggestion for such a seal in the Halling and Rynders et al. combination.

Support for claim 22 is seen in claims 1, 7 (first layer material), and 3 (second layer


Ser. No. 10/002,684

material). Claim 22 is believed patentable over the cited art. Support for claim 23 is found in claim 8, 24 in 9, and 25 in 6.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-9 and 21-25 are in condition for allowance.

Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William B. Slate
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: April 28, 2003